Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08609 01 OF 02 061824Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
----------086573 061830Z /41
P 061810Z JUN 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0502

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 08609

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 220, JUNE 6, 1978
(SALT TWO - 1774)

REFS: A. SALTTWO-1770 B. SALTTWO-1769

SUMMARY. SOVIETS REITERATED SOME EARLIER QUESTIONS ON US PROPOSALS REGARDING HEAVY BOMBER DEFINITION. US INDICATED ENTIRE MATTER UNDER STUDY AND REPLIES WOULD BE MADE LATER. US TABLED ITS JUNE 1 PLENARY PROPOSAL TO LIMIT RVS ON POSSIBLE EXEMPTED NEW TYPE OF ICBM TO MAXIMUM NUMBER FLIGHT-TESTED OR DEPLOYED AS OF APRIL 15, 1978. SOVIETS SAID US PROPOSAL WOULD BE STUDIED IN CONTEXT OF PROBLEM AS A WHOLE. END SUMMARY.

1. SMOLIN REFERRED TO SEMENOV'S PLENARY STATEMENT OF JUNE 1 (REF A) THAT THERE APPEARS TO BE NO DIFFERENCE IN THE SIDES' UNDERSTANDING OF TERM "FUNCTIONALLY-RELATED OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES" AND THAT IF US CONTINUES TO INSIST ON COMMON UNDERSTANDING REGARDING TERM, THIS COULD BE DISCUSSED. FIRST, HOWEVER, THEY WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF US
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08609 01 OF 02 061824Z

CONTINUES TO BELIEVE IT NECESSARY TO HAVE A COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON FRODS, IN ADDITION TO SECOND/THIRD AGREED STATEMENT TO ART II.3? PEREZ ASKED IN RETURN WHETHER SOVIET SIDE HAD ANY VIEWS CONTRARY TO US PROPOSAL FOR THE COMMON UNDERSTANDING. SMOLIN REPLIED THAT SIDES DO NOT HAVE DIFFERENCES REGARDING ESSENCE OF FRODS THEMSELVES. WORDS IN BRACKETS IN RELEVANT AGREED STATEMENT DID NOT

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

APPLY TO CONCEPT OF FRODS BUT TO OTHER ASPECTS OF HEAVY BOMBER DEFINITION. QUESTION REMAINING IS IN WHAT CASES FRODS WOULD BE USED. SOVIET PROPOSAL WOULD APPLY THEM TO PARAS 1, 2 AND 3 OF AGREED STATEMENT, WHILE US PROPOSAL EXTENDS ONLY TO PARAS 1 AND 2. HOWEVER, SPHERE OF APPLICATION OF FRODS NOTION WDULD NOT BE DIFFERENT.

2. SMOLIN COMPARED LANGUAGE IN US-PROPOSED COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON FRODS TO SECOND/THIRD AGREED STATEMENT, SUGGESTING THAT COMMON UNDERSTANDING WOULD DUPLICATE ALREADY AGREED LANGUAGE. IF US INSISTS ON THIS, IT CAN BE CONSIDERED, BUT TAUTOLOGY SHOULD BE AVOIDED IF POSSIBLE. ON THE OTHER HAND, THIS WOULD NOT BE FIRST OR LAST INSTANCE OF TAUTOLOGY IN JDT. PEREZ NOTED THAT PROPOSED COMMON UNDERSTANDING CONTAINS PHRASE ABOUT DIFFERENCES IN THE "OBSERVABLE FEATURES" WHICH IS NOT IN AGREED STATEMENT. US IS CAREFULLY REVIEWING SOVIET JUNE 1 STATEMENT, AS WELL AS DRAFTING GROUP COMMENTS, AND WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF THERE IS ANYTHING IN COMMON UNDERSTANDING WHICH RAISES QUESTIONS ON SOVIET SIDE. HE ALSO NOTED THAT DIFFERENCES STILL REMAIN REGARDING A TYPE RULE FOR ASBM CARRIERS.

3. SMOLIN EXPLAINED THAT SOVIETS DID NOT OBJECT TO FRODS DEFINITION, THEY MERELY SAW NO REASON FOR A SEPARATE DEFINITION, AS MATTER IS ALREADY COVERED IN AGREED STATEMENT. PEREZ NOTED THAT US POSITION WAS TO HAVE COMMON UNDER-
SECRET

SECRET

STANDING, BUT WE WOULD TAKE SOVIET VIEWS INTO ACCOUNT AND RETURN TO SUBJECT IN NEAR FUTURE.

4. SMOLIN CALLED AGAIN FOR USE OF SOVIET DESIGNATIONS WHEN LISTING SOVIET HEAVY BOMBERS IN ART. II.3, AN "EDITORIAL" CORRECTION WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REMEDIED LONG AGO, IN HIS VIEW. IF US WISHES TO HAVE A COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO INDICATE HOW DESIGNATORS USED BY BOTH SIDES CORRESPOND THIS CAN BE CONSIDERED, AS WAS DONE FOR EXAMPLE IN THIRD COMMON UNDERSTANDING TO II.5. PEREZ RESPONDED THAT US WAS REVIEWING MATTER' WE UNDERSTAND SOVIET POINT OF VIEW AND FEEL QUESTION CAN BE RESOLVED IN CONTEXT OF RESOLVING ENTIRE PARAGRAPH. SMOLIN CONCLUDED BY NOTING THAT HE ALSO HOPED FOR ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS SOVIET SIDE HAD POSED EARLIER IN DRAFTING GROUP RELATIVE TO US POSITION ON HEAVY BOMBERS. PEREZ NOTED THAT US HAS ALSO RAISED QUESTIONS REGARDING SOVIET PROPOSALS ON THIS SUBJECT AND HOPED THAT SOVIET SIDE WILL CONSIDER THEM IN ORDER TO CONTINUE DIALOGUE. SMOLIN SAID US COULD REST ASSURED THAT SOVIETS WERE STUDYING THOSE US QUESTIONS TO WHICH THEY HAD NOT YET REPLIED.

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08609 02 OF 02 061824Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
----------086574 061829Z /47
P 061810Z JUN 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0503

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 08609

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

5. PEREZ TABLED US PROPOSAL FOR SECOND AGREED STATEMENT TO PARA 9 OF ART. IV OF TREATY AND REVIEWED HIS JUNE 1 PLENARY STATEMENT ON THAT SUBJECT (REF B). SMOLIN REPLIED THAT US PROPOSAL WOULD BE STUDIED IN CONTEXT OF PROBLEM AS A WHOLE. AT THIS STAGE, IT WAS NOT PROPER FOR SOVIET SIDE TO COMMENT.

6. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 9. EARLE

SECRET

NNN

Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MEETING REPORTS, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 jun 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA08609
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780236-0655
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780693/aaaadbsg.tel
Line Count: 152
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 73186e91-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 78 SALT TALKS 1770
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 aug 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2480521
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 220, JUNE 6, 1978 (SALT TWO - 1774)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/73186e91-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014